1
2
3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

26

ORDER – 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

ROBERT LEE YATES, JR.,

Petitioner,

v.

STEPHEN D. SINCLAIR,

Respondent.

Case No. C13-0842RSM

ORDER ON PETITIONER'S MOTION TO AUTHORIZE RELIANCE UPON EVIDENCE PRESENTED DURING THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING

THIS IS A CAPITAL CASE

THIS MATTER came before the Court on Petitioner's Motion to Authorize Reliance Upon Evidence Presented during the Evidentiary Hearing. Dkt. #99. Petitioner asks the Court to allow him to rely on evidence admitted at his recent evidentiary hearing, when prosecuting his current habeas petition. *Id.* The Court finds this motion wholly unnecessary. As Respondent has noted, the Court previously ruled that three of Petitioner's habeas claims – claims 2, 6, and 10 from his First Amended Petition – warranted further factual development and therefore the Court conducted an evidentiary hearing concerning those three claims on March 6-7, 2017. Dkt. #100 at 1. In its Order directing that the hearing be conducted, the Court informed the parties that it would consider evidence from that hearing when evaluating Petitioner's claims. *See* Dkt. #64. Indeed, that was the very purpose of the hearing. Moreover, Respondent agrees the Court may consider the testimony and evidence presented at the evidentiary hearing. Dkt. #100 at 1. Thus, it is not clear why Petitioner filed the instant

motion. However, since there are no objections, and to make the record clean, the Court will grant Petitioner's motion.

In addition, it now appears that both parties agree no second amended habeas petition is required as a result of the evidentiary hearing. Dkts. #99 and #100.

Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS:

- 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Reliance on Evidence (Dkt. #99) is GRANTED.
- 2. No later than ten (10) days from the date of this Order the parties shall submit a proposed briefing schedule setting forth a timeline for any supplemental briefing on Petitioner's existing Claims 2, 6 and 10 as a result of the evidentiary hearing, and for Petitioner's Reply brief. Once a proposed briefing schedule has been received, the Court will review the proposal and issue an Order setting a briefing schedule and replacing Petitioner's habeas petition for consideration on the Court's motion calendar.

DATED this 30 day of May, 2017.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE